

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

Jermaine Hampton,

Plaintiff,

v.

The State of Nevada, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-00578-APG-DJA

**Order**

Before the Court are two motions by *pro se* Plaintiff Jermaine Hampton, an inmate at the Lovelock Correctional Center. Plaintiff changed his address to the Lovelock Correctional Center on February 17, 2022. (ECF No. 110). Plaintiff later filed a motion for a copy of the docket sheet and complete copy of ECF No. 113—a notice that Plaintiff’s mail had been returned undeliverable—explaining that he only received the first page of the filing. (ECF No. 116). Plaintiff also filed a motion to proceed filing by mail and to be served complete copies of ECF No. 101 and ECF No. 109—both orders—and ECF No. 113, explaining that he did not receive ECF No. 101 or 109 and reiterating his concerns about ECF No. 113. (ECF No. 117).

The Court grants Plaintiff’s request for a copy of the docket sheet and denies his request for a copy of ECF No. 113. It appears that Plaintiff has had difficulty receiving certain docket items during his move to the Lovelock Correctional Center. Given this difficulty, the Court finds good cause to send Plaintiff a copy of the docket. Regarding Plaintiff’s request for a complete copy of ECF No. 113, the Court notes that what Plaintiff received is all that was filed. ECF No. 113 is simply a notice that the envelope containing ECF No. 109 was returned undeliverable. That notice contains only the first page of ECF No. 109 to demonstrate which document was returned. Because Plaintiff received the entire copy of ECF No. 113, the Court denies this request. It orders, however, that Plaintiff be mailed a copy of the CM/ECF Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) receipt accompanying ECF No. 113.

1 The Court grants Plaintiff's request for copies of ECF No. 101 and ECF No. 109.  
2 However, it denies his request to proceed entirely by mail. Plaintiff asserts that, since he arrived  
3 at the Lovelock Correctional Center, he has been deprived of "properly receiving the most crucial  
4 filings of his civil action." Plaintiff elaborates that he was housed at Southern Desert  
5 Correctional Center when ECF No. 101 and ECF No. 109 were mailed out. Because Plaintiff  
6 provides no other potential reason for not receiving these filings, it appears that Plaintiff's move  
7 may have caused ECF No. 101 and ECF No. 109 to not be delivered. Since Plaintiff filed the  
8 instant motions, none of his mail has been returned undeliverable and Plaintiff has filed his own  
9 motion. Moreover, the Court has enacted electronic filing procedures to be used in civil rights  
10 cases at the Lovelock Correctional Center, which procedures have been in place since 2015.  
11 (ECF No. 115 at 1). The Court thus denies Plaintiff's request to proceed entirely by mail.

12 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 116) is **granted in**  
13 **part** regarding his request for a copy of the docket sheet and **denied in part** regarding his request  
14 for a copy of ECF No. 113. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to mail Plaintiff a copy of the  
15 docket sheet in his case and a copy of the CM/ECF NEF receipt for ECF No. 113.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 117) is **granted in part**  
17 regarding his request to be sent ECF No. 101 and ECF No. 109. It is **denied in part** regarding  
18 his request to proceed entirely by mail. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to mail Plaintiff  
19 complete copies of ECF No. 101 and ECF No. 109, including the CM/ECF NEF receipt for both.

20 DATED: May 9, 2022

21   
22 DANIEL J. ALBRECHTS  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28